friends on the other side said Republicans hated the bill and decided to kill it. Another said our effort to make the bill better through the amendment process was ''one of the worst stunts he had seen in 25 years as a legislator.'' What made those observations particularly absurd is that on that same day, the very same day those quotes were made, the bill passed 96 to 2.

Last week, many of our colleagues on the other side were reviving their charges of noncooperation after we took up the minimum wage bill. One said Republicans don't tend to vote for a minimum wage increase. Another said we were putting up obstacles to the bill so we wouldn't have to act on it.

We passed a good ethics and lobby reform bill and we are going to pass a good minimum wage increase bill because of Republican support and because Republicans insisted on a bipartisan package for both ethics and lobbying. That is the reason we saw an overwhelming vote at the end, support on both sides of the aisle. It is only because Republicans insisted on a bipartisan package for the minimum wage bill that I expect at some point in the near future we will see a similar vote on that. We pledged cooperation, and cooperation is exactly what we are offering in these early days of this Congress.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to a period for the transaction for morning business until 3:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, in control of 45 minutes and the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SPECTER, in control of 30 minutes.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, Senator DORGAN and I have arranged to switch times. He graciously consented to that. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for the 30-minute special order that was already announced and that Senator DORGAN be recognized for 45 minutes when my time is concluded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TELEVISING OF SUPREME COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment about S. 344, which provides for the televising of Supreme Court proceedings. This bill is cosponsored by Senator GRASSLEY, Senator DURBIN, Senator SCHUMER, Senator FEINGOLD, and, with unanimous consent Senator CORNYN—a bipartisan representation. It is identical with legislation introduced in the last Congress after having been voted out of committee, and was voted out of committee on a 12-to-6 vote. It was previously introduced in 2005. It had a hearing on November 9 of 2005 and was reported out of committee on March 30 of 2006.

The essential provision is to require televising proceedings at the Supreme Court of the United States unless the Court determines on an individual basis that there would be an inappropriate occasion and a violation of the due process rights of the parties.

The thrust of this legislation is to bring public attention and understanding of how the Supreme Court of the United States functions, because it is the ultimate decisionmaker on so many—virtually all of the cutting edge questions of our day. The Supreme Court of the United States made the decision in Bush v. Gore, essentially deciding who would be President of the United States. The Supreme Court decides cases on the death penalty, as to who will die.

It decides by 5-to-4 decisions so many vital cases, including partial-birth or late-term abortion, deciding who will live. It decides the question of who will be elected, controlling the constitutional decision on campaign contributions. It decides the constitutionality—again, and all of the cases I mentioned are 5 to 4—on school prayer, on school vouchers, on whether the Ten Commandments may be publicly displayed, on whether affirmative action will be permitted, on whether eminent domain will be allowed—the taking of private property for governmental purposes. The Supreme Court of the United States decides the power of the President as illustrated by Hamdan v. Rumsfeld—that the President does not have a blank check and that the President is not a monarch.

The Supreme Court of the United States, again in a series of 5-to-4 decisions, has decided what is the power of Congress, declaring in U.S. v. Morrison the legislation to protect women against violence unconstitutional because the Court questioned our ''method of reasoning,'' raising a fundamental question as to where is the superiority of the Court's method of reasoning over that of the Congress. But that kind of decision, simply stated, is not understood.

Or the Supreme Court of the United States dealing with the Americans With Disabilities Act, making two decisions which are indistinguishable, upholding the statute on a paraplegic crawling into the courthouse in Tennessee and striking down the constitutionality of the statute when dealing with employment discrimination. They did so on a manufactured test of congruence and proportionality, which is literally picked out of thin air.

Under our Constitution, I respect the standing of the Supreme Court of the United States to be the final arbiter and to make the final decisions. But it is, I think, fundamental that the Court's work, the Court's operation ought to be more broadly understood. That can be achieved by television. Just as these proceedings are televised on C–SPAN, just as the House of Representatives is televised on C–SPAN, so, too, could the Supreme Court be televised on an offer made by C–SPAN to have a separate channel for Supreme Court oral arguments. There are many opportunities for the Court to receive this kind of coverage, to inform the American people about what is going on so that the American people can participate in a meaningful way as to whether the Court is functioning as a super-legislature—which it ought not to do, that being entrusted to the Congress and State legislatures, with the Court's responsibility being to interpret the law.

It should be noted that the individual Justices of the Supreme Court have already been extensively televised. Chief Justice Roberts and Justice Stevens were on ''Prime Time'' on ABC TV. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was on CBS with Mike Wallace. Justice Breyer was on ''FOX News'' Sunday. Justice Scalia and Justice Breyer had an extensive debate last December, which is available for viewing on the Web—and in television archives. So there has been very extensive participation by Court members, which totally undercuts one of the arguments, that the notoriety would imperil the security of Supreme Court Justices.

It is also worth noting that a number of the Justices have stated support for televising the Supreme Court. For example, Justice Stevens, in an article by Henry Weinstein on July 14, 1989, said he supported cameras in the Supreme Court and told the annual Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference at about the same time that, ''In my view, it is worth a try.''

Justice Stevens has been quoted recently stating his favorable disposition to televising the Supreme Court.

Justice Breyer, during his confirmation hearings in 1994, indicated support for televising Supreme Court proceedings. He has since equivocated, but has also noted that it would be a wonderful teaching device.

In a December 13, 2006 article by David Pereira, Justice Scalia said he favored cameras in the Supreme Court to show the public that a majority of the caseload involves dull stuff.

In December of 2000, an article by Marjorie Cohn noted Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's support of camera coverage, so long as it is gavel to gavel—which can be arranged.

Justice Alito, in his Senate confirmation hearings last year, said that as a member of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals he voted to admit cameras. He added that it would be presumptuous of him to state a final position until he